

REMARKS

RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 121

Requirement For Restriction Under 37 C.F.R. §1.142

The Examiner has required that prosecution of the subject case be restricted to one of the following inventions: Group I, claims 1-5 drawn to multifunctional polymer; and Group II, claims 6-18, drawn to process for preparing a multi-functional polymer. Claim 19 has been cancelled and therefore the issues raised by the Examiner with respect thereto have been rendered moot.

In an effort to further prosecution at this time, the Applicants hereby elect to prosecute Group II, claims 6-18, drawn to process for preparing a multi-functional polymer. Claims 1-5 have been cancelled.

Election of Species

The Examiner has also required, in the event that Group II is elected, an election of species. According to the Examiner, the application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: the processes of claims 6, 12, 17, and 18. The Examiner believes that no claim is generic to the four separate process claims. As a result, the Examiner believes that the election must identify one of the processes recited in claim 6, 12, 17, or 18.

Initially, the undersigned wishes to thank the Examiner for the helpful information provided during the telephone interview of June 14, 2005. The subject of the telephone interview was to ensure that the Applicants properly responded to the Election of Species Requirement. In view of that interview, Applicants believe that the following properly addresses the requirement.

Applicants hereby elect the process set forth in claim 6 together with the claims dependent thereon. It is the Applicants' understanding, both in view of the recitation in the Office Action and from the telephone interview, that election of a claim, such as claim 6, satisfies the election requirement. In other words, no further specificity is believed to be required at this time.

Nonetheless, in the even of a misunderstanding, Applicants recommend that further searching and examination can be conducted by the Examiner in view of recitation provided in dependent claims 7-11, which are believed to add further

specificity to claim 6.

CONCLUSION

A formal Notice of Allowance of claims 6-18 is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner care to discuss any of the foregoing in greater detail, the undersigned attorney would welcome a telephone call.

No new claims have been added and therefore no additional fees are believed due at this time. Nonetheless, in the event that a fee required for the filing of this document is missing or insufficient, the undersigned attorney hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge payment of any fees associated with this communication or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-0925.

Respectfully submitted,



Arthur M. Reginelli, Reg. No. 40,139
Renner, Kenner, Greive, Bobak, Taylor & Weber
Fourth Floor, First National Tower
Akron, Ohio 44308-1456
Telephone: (330) 376-1242

Attorney for Applicants

June 24, 2005